

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiki (US 5,406,308), and claims 2, 4, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiki in view of Sekido et al. (US 5,999,158). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon a combination of prior art references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in independent claims 1 and 3, and hence dependent claims 2, and 4-7.

The Office Action alleges that Shiki discloses a method of driving a liquid crystal display including “generating a reset signal (HSET) at the enable initiation time of data signal (HSYNC) and resetting a source shift clock signal for sampling video data (see figures 1-2, 11-14; column 3, lines 30-40 and column 5, lines 7-43).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the alleged “reset signal (HSET)” cited by the Examiner is not any type of reset signal. For example, as disclosed by Shiki (col. 3, lines 58-61), “after the constant time period HSET has passed, the horizontal timing generating circuit 8 generates the horizontal start timing signal HS as shown in FIG. 4B.” Furthermore, as disclosed by Shiki (col. 5, lines 8-16), the value HSET is not any type of reset signal, but is a variable of the horizontal timing circuit 8 that is used along with the value VSET of the vertical timing circuit 9 by a determining circuit 10 to calculate an image size of one frame of a video signal in accordance with horizontal and vertical synchronization signals HSYNC and VSYNC. Thus, Applicant submits that Shiki is completely silent with respect to a method of driving a liquid crystal display including, at least, steps of “generating a reset signal at said enable initiation time of data signal,” and “resetting a source shift clock signal for sampling the video data in response

to the reset signal,” as recited by independent claim 1, and hence dependent claim 2. Similarly, Applicant respectfully submits that Shiki is completely silent with respect to a driving apparatus for a liquid crystal display including “a reset signal generator for detecting an enable initiation time of a data enable signal for indicating a time interval when a [video] data exists to generate a reset signal,” and “a reset means for resetting a source shift clock for sampling the video data at said enable initiation time,” as recited by independent claim 3, and hence dependent claims 4-7.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Shiki discloses driving signal lines by a horizontal start timing signal that is obtained by delaying a horizontal synchronization signal with a first time period, and driving scan lines by a vertical start timing signal that is obtained by delaying a vertical synchronization signal with a second time period, wherein the first and second time periods are changed in accordance with a size of one frame of video signal.

Applicant further respectfully asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Sekido et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Shiki. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sekido et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Shiki.

Since the Office Action fails to meet the requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to independent claims 1 and 3, claims 1 and 3 are not obvious, and hence dependent claims 2 and 4-7 are not obvious. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: December 14, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000